

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,665	10/10/2003	James Edward Aston	RSW920030166US1	1807
57295 7590 01/31/2008 DILLION & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, TONGOC	
SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
	•			
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/683,665	ASTON ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tongoc Tran	2134					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	-				
THE REPLY FILED on 1/15/2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or							
(3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:		y must be filed within one of the					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. Atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension fee under 37 final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b)					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	pe filed within the time period set fo	orth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS		e 10 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co 							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		TE below),					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		timely filed amendment canceling					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 30-39</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ut hafara as an the data of filing a l	Nation of Annual will not be entered					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is necessary					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attached.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the claimed limitation differs from the cited prior art, Vaidya, in step of "in response to said target file being opened by said associated executing agent, scanning content of said target file for viruses by applying virus signatures stored in said subset of said plurality of said anti-birus sets associated with said executing agent". Applicant argues, "[i]n other words, the claimed scanning is triggered by a network object as taught by Vaidya). In addition, the claimed target file, which is associated with an executing agent, is not taught or suggested by Vaidya and Hypponen.

Examiner asserts that the network objects taught by Vaidya referred in the Specificiation include server or network devices such as router or firewalls as well as applications and files stored in memory with those devices (Vaidya, col. 5, lines 59-60). Since the network objects including applications and files stored in the network devices. As is well understood in the computer art, applications, for example, program code for a firewall, commonly bundled together with various tools, or various files would be triggered by a call from an application and/or files. Therefore, Vaidya's teaching of "attack signature profiles are organized into sets of attack signature profiles which are assigned to netowrk objects based on securit; y reqiirements of the network objects (col. 3, lines 28-30) and the network objects includes network devices and further includes applications and files stored in the memory of the network devices (col. 5, lines 59-60) met the claimed limitation of "the executing agent" and "the target files". The second cited prior art, Hypponen teaches three separate types of database containing different types of known macro viruses (see Hypponen, Abstract). Hypponen further teaches anti-virus software "generally scans data being written to or read" (access) "from a computer's hard drive for presence of macros having a checksum corresponding to one of the identified viruses" (Hypponen, coll 2, lines 1-5). Therefore, combining Vaidya and Hypponen would have been obvious. Examiner asserts that the final rejection is proper.

WAR PARENT EXAMINER